



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,552	03/13/2004	Gerald B. Rosenberg	RSNB4000	7815
23488	7590	08/08/2007		
GERALD B ROSENBERG NEW TECH LAW 260 SHERIDAN AVENUE SUITE 208 PALO ALTO, CA 94306-2009			EXAMINER LE, MIRANDA	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/08/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/799,552

Applicant(s)

ROSENBERG, GERALD B.

Examiner

Miranda Le

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 26-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 26-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/18/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 05/18/2007.

Claims 1-8, 26-36 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claims 26, 30, 33, 34 have been amended. This action is made Final.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 05/18/2007, has been received, entered into the record, and considered. See attached form PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaufman et al. (US Patent No. 6,240,408).

Kaufman anticipated independent claim 1 by the following:

As per claim 1, Kaufman teaches a computer system enabling user directed information research against an authoritatively organized document collection, said computer system comprising:

a) a database (*i.e. authoritative database, col. 3, lines 48-64*) storing first data identifying a set of authoritative statements (*i.e. the sentences, col. 3, lines 38-48*) present within the

documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection, second data specifying the locations (*i.e. the position of the sentence within the document, col. 3, lines 38-48*) of the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection, third data specifying correlated associations (*i.e. weighting the contribution made by each sentence, col. 3, lines 38-48*) between the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection (*i.e. candidate documents, col. 6, lines 1-8*) (*col. 3, lines 19-64; col. 12, lines 6-14*); and

b) a processor (*i.e. CPU 14 in Fig. 1*), coupleable to said database, operative to generate a mesh representational view (*Figs. 3, 4*) of the correlated associations between the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions and wherein said processor is responsive to user input for navigation through said mesh representational view and user determined selection of a subset of said of authoritative assertions (*i.e. The calculation of query-word-conductance is illustrated in FIG. 3 for a representative query in which eight distinct query-words {t.sub.1, t.sub.2, . . . t.sub.8} are distributed among six sentences {s.sub.1, s.sub.2 . . . s.sub.6}. Because there are eight distinct query-words, there are eight query-word-conductances to be calculated, col. 7, lines 13-18*) (*col. 7, line 19 to col. 8, line 9; col. 9, line 24 to col. 10, line 45; col. 12, lines 6-14*).

As per claim 2, Kaufman teaches the computer system of claim 1 wherein said third data defines relative distance weighted, directional associations between the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined authoritative

document collection (*col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 64; col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 36; col. 12, lines 6-45*).

5. Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mielenhausen et al. (US Patent No. 6,529,911).

As per claim 26, Mielenhausen teaches a computer-based system for developing a compilation of authoritative knowledge, said computer-based system comprising:

a first database of authoritative knowledge including an authoritative document collection including first and second documents, said first database including a plurality of authoritative statements present within said authoritative document collection (*i.e. a first data structure recorded in the memory, the first data structure encoding a number of projects, a second data structure recorded in the memory, the second data structure encoding a number of propositions, col. 2, lines 2-35*), wherein each said authoritative statement includes at least one authoritative assertion and at least one authoritative citation (*i.e. The user can create, edit and view a record of the citations or other results obtained from the search, the status of review of the results, and the authorities relating to the proposition, col. 3, lines 18-28*);

a second database of weight values (*i.e. a third data structure recorded in the memory, the third data structure encoding a number of authorities, and each of the propositions and authorities being associated with at least one of the projects, col. 3, lines 18-28*) interrelating said plurality of authoritative statements, wherein said weight values include a predetermined reference weight value (*i.e. the persuasion factor weights, col. 12, lines 3-33*) that interrelates a first authoritative assertion of a first authoritative statement present within said first document

Art Unit: 2167

with a second authoritative assertion present within said second document, wherein said first authoritative statement includes a first authoritative citation that identifies a defined sub-portion of said second document, wherein said first authoritative assertion is semantically identified within said second authoritative assertion within said defined sub-portion of said second document, and wherein said predetermined reference weight value represents the correlated semantic associativity of said first and second authoritative assertions dependent on said first authoritative citation (*i.e. The user can also add other persuasion factors, and adjust the weight assigned to each persuasion factor for all authorities. (b) Through LRO's View/Copy Ranked Related Authority Data Window, the user can view all authority data that is tied to both the authority highlighted in the Authorities Related to Project's Proposition Window, and the proposition highlighted in the Project's Proposition Window, with the authorities ranked in accordance with their persuasiveness. LRO determines the persuasion rank in accordance with the persuasion factor weights, for example, by summing the weights LRO displays the data in the Propositions Report format, col. 12, lines 3-33).*

a viewer, coupled to said first and second databases, enabling presentation of a subset of said plurality of authoritative statements including a set of identified authoritative statements and a set of supplemental authoritative statements, wherein said set of supplemental authoritative statements is successively selected based on associations determined from said second database of weight values and relative to said set of identified authoritative statements (*i.e. A data processing method for organizing, analyzing, recording, storing, and reporting research results, comprising the steps of: inputting user identification data, inputting information related to a plurality of research projects, inputting information related to a plurality of propositions,*

associating each of the propositions with at least one of the research projects, inputting information on a plurality of authorities, associating each of the authorities with at least one of said plurality of research projects, outputting a propositions report displaying the information associated with selected propositions, and outputting an authorities report displaying the information associated with selected authorities, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35).

first controls, coupled to said viewer, operative to influence the selection of said set of supplemental authoritative statements (*i.e. A data processing method for organizing, analyzing, recording, storing, and reporting research results, comprising the steps of: inputting user identification data, inputting information related to a plurality of research projects, inputting information related to a plurality of propositions, associating each of the propositions with at least one of the research projects, inputting information on a plurality of authorities, associating each of the authorities with at least one of said plurality of research projects, outputting a propositions report displaying the information associated with selected propositions, and outputting an authorities report displaying the information associated with selected authorities, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35).*

second controls, coupled to said viewer, operative to produce a report of said set of identified authoritative statements (*i.e. A data processing method for organizing, analyzing, recording, storing, and reporting research results, comprising the steps of: inputting user identification data, inputting information related to a plurality of research projects, inputting information related to a plurality of propositions, associating each of the propositions with at least one of the research projects, inputting information on a plurality of authorities, associating each of the authorities with at least one of said plurality of research projects, outputting a*

propositions report displaying the information associated with selected propositions, and outputting an authorities report displaying the information associated with selected authorities, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35).

As per claim 30, Mielenhausen teaches an apparatus for processing a document collection to enable authoritative information research, said apparatus comprising:

a database that provides for the storage of data with respect to a set of authoritative assertions occurring within the documents of a predetermined authoritative document collection *(i.e. A data processing system for organizing, analyzing, recording, storing, and reporting research results consists of: a computer having a memory, a central processing unit, and an input/output unit, a first data structure recorded in the memory, the first data structure encoding a number of projects, a second data structure recorded in the memory, the second data structure encoding a number of propositions, a third data structure recorded in the memory, the third data structure encoding a number of authorities, and each of the propositions and authorities being associated with at least one of the projects, and a computer program executing in the central processing unit, the computer program defining structural and functional relationships among the projects, propositions, and authorities, the computer program receiving information on the projects, propositions, and authorities from an operator through the input/output unit, and the computer program organizing the information and displaying relationships among the projects, propositions, authorities and information to the operator through the input/output unit; col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35); and*

a processor coupleable to access the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection, said processor being operative to generate first data identifying said set of authoritative assertions, said first data further identifying the locations of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection, said processor being further operative to generate second data containing a weighted correlation (*i.e.* *The user can also add other persuasion factors, and adjust the weight assigned to each persuasion factor for all authorities.* (b) *Through LRO's View/Copy Ranked Related Authority Data Window, the user can view all authority data that is tied to both the authority highlighted in the Authorities Related to Project's Proposition Window, and the proposition highlighted in the Project's Proposition Window, with the authorities ranked in accordance with their persuasiveness. LRO determines the persuasion rank in accordance with the persuasion factor weights, for example, by summing the weights LRO displays the data in the Propositions Report format, col. 12, lines 3-33)* of the mutual relative occurrence of the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection, and wherein said processor provides for the storage of said first and second data in said database (*i.e. A data processing method for organizing, analyzing, recording, storing, and reporting research results, comprising the steps of: inputting user identification data, inputting information related to a plurality of research projects, inputting information related to a plurality of propositions, associating each of the propositions with at least one of the research projects, inputting information on a plurality of authorities, associating each of the authorities with at least one of said plurality of research projects, outputting a propositions report displaying the information associated with selected propositions, and outputting an*

Art Unit: 2167

authorities report displaying the information associated with selected authorities, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35),

whereby said first and second data provides an authoritatively related basis for analyzing the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection (*i.e. A data processing method for organizing, analyzing, recording, storing, and reporting research results, comprising the steps of: inputting user identification data, inputting information related to a plurality of research projects, inputting information related to a plurality of propositions, associating each of the propositions with at least one of the research projects, inputting information on a plurality of authorities, associating each of the authorities with at least one of said plurality of research projects, outputting a propositions report displaying the information associated with selected propositions, and outputting an authorities report displaying the information associated with selected authorities, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35).*

As per claim 27, Mielenhausen teaches the computer-based system of claim 26 wherein said first controls are operative to include authoritative statements of said set of supplemental authoritative statements in said set of identified authoritative statements (*i.e. A data processing method for organizing, analyzing, recording, storing, and reporting research results, comprising the steps of: inputting user identification data, inputting information related to a plurality of research projects, inputting information related to a plurality of propositions, associating each of the propositions with at least one of the research projects, inputting information on a plurality of authorities, associating each of the authorities with at least one of said plurality of research projects, outputting a propositions report displaying the information associated with selected*

propositions, and outputting an authorities report displaying the information associated with selected authorities, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35).

As per claim 28, Mielenhausen teaches the computer-based system of claim 27 further comprising a parser operative on said report to initially determine said set of identified authoritative statements (*i.e. A data processing method for organizing, analyzing, recording, storing, and reporting research results, comprising the steps of: inputting user identification data, inputting information related to a plurality of research projects, inputting information related to a plurality of propositions, associating each of the propositions with at least one of the research projects, inputting information on a plurality of authorities, associating each of the authorities with at least one of said plurality of research projects, outputting a propositions report displaying the information associated with selected propositions, and outputting an authorities report displaying the information associated with selected authorities, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35).*

As per claim 29, Mielenhausen teaches the computer-based system of claim 28 wherein said report is a literate report of said set of identified authoritative statements (*i.e. , outputting a propositions report displaying the information associated with selected propositions, and outputting an authorities report displaying the information associated with selected authorities, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 35; A principal object and advantage of the data processing system and method is that it is designed for anyone who does legal research, or who supervises or reviews the legal research of others. The potential users include attorneys, judges, law*

professors, law clerks, law students, paralegals, and law librarians, col. 2, lines 36-41).

As per claim 31, Mielenhausen teaches the apparatus of claim 30 wherein said second data further contains weighted correlations representing semantic similarity of the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions (*i.e. The user can also add other persuasion factors, and adjust the weight assigned to each persuasion factor for all authorities. (b) Through LRO's View/Copy Ranked Related Authority Data Window, the user can view all authority data that is tied to both the authority highlighted in the Authorities Related to Project's Proposition Window, and the proposition highlighted in the Project's Proposition Window, with the authorities ranked in accordance with their persuasiveness. LRO determines the persuasion rank in accordance with the persuasion factor weights, for example, by summing the weights LRO displays the data in the Propositions Report format, col. 12, lines 3-33).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaufman et al. (US Patent No. 6,240,408), in view of Farahat et al. (US Pub No. 20030226100).

As per claim 3, Kaufman does not teach the computer system of claim 2 wherein the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions are representable as nodes within said mesh representational view and wherein said third data determines the relative interconnection of said nodes within said mesh representational view.

However, Farahat teaches the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions are representable as nodes within said mesh representational view and wherein said third data determines the relative interconnection of said nodes within said mesh (*i.e. matrix*) representational view ([0101]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Kaufman and Farahat at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kaufman to include the above limitations as taught by Farahat.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to combine textual authority with social authority in view of Farahat ([0101]), as doing so would give the added benefit of combining textual authoritativeness with social authority to provide a more complete and robust estimate of a document's authoritativeness as taught by Farahat ([0015]).

As per claim 4, Farahat teaches the computer system of claim 3 wherein said database further stores fourth data identifying authoritative citations in correspondence with the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions, wherein selection of said subset includes selection of the corresponding authoritative citations, said processor being further operative to generate a literate report of said subset of said set of authoritative assertions and corresponding authoritative citations ([0019]).

As per claim 5, Farahat teaches the computer system of claim 4 wherein generation of said literate report includes syntactic processing of said subset of said set of authoritative assertions.

As per claim 6, Farahat teaches the computer system of claim 5 wherein generation of said literate report includes reformation of said corresponding authoritative citations dependent on the order of occurrence of said corresponding authoritative citations within said literate report ([0019; 0113-0133]).

As per claim 7, Farahat teaches the computer system of claim 6 wherein generation of said literate report includes maintenance of predetermined report content provided in response to user input relative to said subset of said set of authoritative assertions and corresponding inclusion of said predetermined report content in said literate report ([0019; 0113-0133]).

As per claim 8, Farahat teaches the computer system of claim 7 wherein said processor is

Art Unit: 2167

operative to maintain source versions of said subset of said set of authoritative assertions, said corresponding authoritative citations, and said predetermined report content for reference in connection with the syntactic processing of said subset of said set of authoritative assertions, including said predetermined report content, and the reformation of said corresponding authoritative citations ([0088-0101; 0113-0133]).

8. Claims 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mielenhausen et al. (US Patent No. 6,529,911), in view of Page et al. (US Patent No. 6,285,999).

As per claim 32, Mielenhausen teaches the apparatus of claim 31, but does not specifically teach said first and second data defines a weighted correlation mesh interrelating the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions.

Page teaches said first and second data defines a weighted correlation mesh interrelating the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions (*i.e. A linked database (i.e. any database of documents containing mutual citations, such as the world wide web or other hypermedia archive, a dictionary or thesaurus, and a database of academic articles, patents, or court cases) can be represented as a directed graph of N nodes, where each node corresponds to a web page document and where the directed connections between nodes correspond to links from one document to another. A given node has a set of forward links that connect it to children nodes, and a set of backward links that connect it to parent nodes, col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 4).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Mielenhausen and Page at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Mielenhausen to include the limitations as taught by Page.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to have a linked database (*i.e. any database of documents containing mutual citations, such as the world wide web or other hypermedia archive, a dictionary or thesaurus, and a database of academic articles, patents, or court cases*) that can be represented as a directed graph of N nodes in view of Page, as doing so would give the added benefit of delivering a technique for ranking documents within a database whose content has a large variation in quality and importance (Summary) as taught by Page.

As per claim 33, Page teaches said weighted correlations include directional information reflecting the ordered of occurrence of the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined document collection such that said first and second data defines a directionally weighted correlation mesh whereby said first and second data provides a directed basis for analyzing the ordered occurrence of conceptual issues represented by sequences of authoritative assertions occurring within said set of authoritative assertions (*i.e. A linked database (i.e. any database of documents containing mutual citations, such as the world wide web or other hypermedia archive, a dictionary or thesaurus, and a database of academic articles, patents, or court cases) can be represented as a directed graph of N nodes, where each node corresponds to a web page document and where the directed connections between nodes correspond to links from one document to another. A given node has*

a set of forward links that connect it to children nodes, and a set of backward links that connect it to parent nodes, col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 4).

As per claim 34, Page teaches said second data, as generated by said processor, correlates first and second predetermined authoritative assertions by a weighted ordered distance metric derived by analysis of the mutual relative locations of said first and second predetermined authoritative assertions within documents of co-occurrence of said predetermined document collection (*i.e. A linked database (i.e. any database of documents containing mutual citations, such as the world wide web or other hypermedia archive, a dictionary or thesaurus, and a database of academic articles, patents, or court cases) can be represented as a directed graph of N nodes, where each node corresponds to a web page document and where the directed connections between nodes correspond to links from one document to another. A given node has a set of forward links that connect it to children nodes, and a set of backward links that connect it to parent nodes, col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 4).*

As per claim 35, Page teaches said processor, in generating said second data, computes a semantic affinity metric for the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertion as a basis for establishing conceptual content associations between the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions (*i.e. A linked database (i.e. any database of documents containing mutual citations, such as the world wide web or other hypermedia archive, a dictionary or thesaurus, and a database of academic articles, patents, or court cases) can be represented as a directed graph of N nodes, where each node corresponds to a web page document and where the*

directed connections between nodes correspond to links from one document to another. A given node has a set of forward links that connect it to children nodes, and a set of backward links that connect it to parent nodes, col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 4).

As per claim 36, Page teaches said second data, as generated by said processor, includes cluster association information for the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions, wherein said cluster association information is determined based on said semantic affinity metric as computed for each of the authoritative assertions within said set of authoritative assertions. *(i.e. A linked database (i.e. any database of documents containing mutual citations, such as the world wide web or other hypermedia archive, a dictionary or thesaurus, and a database of academic articles, patents, or court cases) can be represented as a directed graph of N nodes, where each node corresponds to a web page document and where the directed connections between nodes correspond to links from one document to another. A given node has a set of forward links that connect it to children nodes, and a set of backward links that connect it to parent nodes, col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 4).*

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments regarding the prior arts do not suggest the newly amended claims 26-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
10. Applicant's arguments filed 05/18/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reasons:

(a). Applicant argues that the teaching of Kaufman does not disclose “an authoritatively organized document collection”.

On the contrary, Kaufman teaches “an authoritatively organized document collection” as “*Candidate documents derived from a public database such as the Internet are often not subject to stringent editorial review. Thus, in searching such a public database for candidate documents similar, or relevant, to a user-query, it is advantageous to provide an authoritative database to use as a standard against which the similarity of candidate documents from the public database is assessed. Such a database typically includes a multiplicity of reference materials published only after having been subjected to editorial scrutiny*”. (col. 3, lines 48-58).

Kaufman further teaches the step of collecting authoritative documents to generate an authoritative database in Abstract (i.e. to generate authoritative database results), the authoritative database of Kaufman equates to “an authoritatively organized document collection” of Applicant’s.

The knowledge that is within the level of one of ordinary skill is highlighted hereinabove for the Applicant’s convenience. The Examiner believes that Applicant has failed to determine the level of ordinary skill as taught by Kaufman.

(b). Applicants argues that the preamble of claim 1 provides for a computer system that enables research to be conducted specifically against an “authoritatively organized document collection”, as the term defined in the present specification in paragraph 48 (See Remark Page 15).

In response to the preceding argument, the Examiner submits that Kaufman does teach "an authoritatively organized document collection" as pointed out in the above paragraph (a).

Further, in response to applicant's argument that the Kaufman reference fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., citations to internally organize and substantiate the information represented by the collection. Such authoritative document collections, including as exemplary the various scientific and legal document collections) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

It is reminded that Applicant has not defined that " an authoritatively organized document collection employs ...citations to internally organize and substantiate the information represented by the collection. Such authoritative document collections, including as exemplary the various scientific and legal document collections " in the claims. It is proper to use the specification to interpret what the Applicant meant by a word or phrase recited in the claim. However, it is not proper to read limitations appearing in the specification into the claim when these limitations are not recited in the claim. Therefore, it would not be proper for the examiner to give words of the claim special meaning when no such special meaning has been defined by the Applicant in the claim language. Thus, the Examiner's interpretation of the claim scope is consistent with term used.

(c). Applicants argues that Kaufman does not disclose "first data identifying a set of authoritative statements present within the documents".

Kaufman teaches "first data identifying a set of authoritative statements present within the documents" as "For each candidate document, whether it is retrieved from the public

database 22 or the **authoritative database 21**, the document parser 80 identifies boundaries between words and sentences. Thus, for each candidate document, the document parser 80 generates an ordered set of sentences. Each sentence is a set whose elements are the **words found in that sentence**. These **sets of sentences** are then supplied to a document quantizer 90 and to a sentence quantizer 60”, col. 6, lines 1-8.

Note that, first data equates to “words” of Kaufman.

Authoritative statements equate to “sets of sentences” or Kaufman.

These **sets of sentences** belong to the document in the authoritative database; therefore, the documents should be understood as authoritative documents and/or authoritative statements.

Kaufman further teaches the step of collecting authoritative documents to generate an authoritative database in Abstract (i.e. to generate authoritative database results), this authoritative database of Kaufman equates to “an authoritatively organized document collection” of Applicants.

(d). Applicants argues that Kaufman does not teach “pre-identification of any authoritative assertions as first data”.

Applicant is once again reminded that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “pre-identification”) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Notably, the claim invention only recites that “first data identifying a set of authoritative statement” which is taught by Kaufman as aforementioned as words that identify a set of sentences.

(e). The Applicants argues that Kaufman does not teach the database storage of first data.

It should be noted that the term “word” of Kaufman (i.e. first data of claim invention) must be stored in the database 21 or database 22 of Kaufman since the words are selected from document (*i.e. the user can select text from a selected document and designate that selected text to be the user-query, col. 4, lines 56-61, Kaufman*).

(f). Applicants argues that Kaufman does not teach second data specifying the locations of the authoritative assertions.

It is noted that second data equates to “a quantity” of Kaufman (*i.e. a quantity to the sentences making up the candidate document that depends on the position of the sentence within the document col. 3, lines 38-48*).

Locations equates to “position” of Kaufman (*i.e. a quantity to the sentences making up the candidate document that depends on the position of the sentence within the document col. 3, lines 38-48*).

(g). Applicants argues that Kaufman does not teach third data...

Third data equates to “weighting” of Kaufman (*i.e. weighting the contribution made by each sentence, col. 3, lines 38-48*).

Third data further equates to “entries ranked” in the search results of Kaufman (See col. 12, line 49 to col. 13, line 3). Notably, Kaufman discloses using of search result to generate authoritative database results (*i.e. generate authoritative database results, See Abstract*). Therefore, this authoritative database must consist of “entries ranked” (*i.e. third data of claim invention*).

(h). The Applicants argues that Kaufman does not teach the generation of a mesh for representational view.

It has been brought to Applicant’s attention that the result of Kaufman is based on a plurality of factors, “query-word-conductance” calculation, “inverse document frequency” calculation (col. 6, lines 9-27), the document-conductance calculation (col. 8, lines 24-31), as such, one skilled in the art would understand the step of performing the result of Kaufman implied two-or-more dimensional data (*i.e. a mesh for representational view*).

(i). In regards to claim 2, the Applicants’ argument is not persuasive under the same rationale given above to argument (g).

For the reasons set forth above, the claim language as presented is still read on by the Kaufman reference at the cited paragraph in the claim rejections. Arguments as raised are moot since all claim limitations relevant to this issue have been addressed accordingly. Applicant, however, is encouraged to amend the claims to better reflect what applicant intends to claim as the invention.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-4112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham, can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax number to this Art Unit is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Miranda Le
August 01, 2007



APU MOFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER